5. Mr. Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai
6. ,, N. Ramakrishna Pillai
7. ,, A. K. Kumaran Vaidyan
8. ,, K. R. Narayanan
9. ,, M. L. Janardana Pillai
10. ,, P. S. Mahomed
11. ,, Kaviyoor K. K. Kochukunju
12. ,, The Legal Remembrancer
13. ,, Joseph Vithayathil

The motion was put to vote and carried.

THE EZHAVA BILL.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Ambalapuzha* cum *Shertalai*) : സർ, ഈ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട സഭയുടെ പരിഗണനയ്ക്കായി ഈഴവബിൽ ഞാൻ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു,

MR. K. KUNJU PAAICKAR : I second it.

SECRETARY : The little of the Bill shall be the Travancore Ezhava Bill.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : ഈ ബിൽ താഴെപറയുന്ന മെമ്പറന്മാർ അടങ്ങിയ ഒരു സെലക്ട്കമ്മറ്റിക്കു അയയ്ക്കണമെന്നു ഞാൻ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : Sir, in regard to this Bill there has not been any discussion of the principle involved in the Bill I wish to make a few observations about the principle involved in the Bill and express my opinion for the consideration of the House before the motion for reference is allowed to be made.

This is a measure intended to repeal and to re-enact the Ezhava Act with certain modifications. Honourable members of this House will be aware of the troubles and difficulties which the Legislature had to undergo in enacting the present Ezhava Act. It is scarcely 14 years since that Act came into force. Several of the provisions were being acted upon and applauded by members of the community and so far as Government are aware, there has not been any indication on the part of the members of that community expressing disapprobation of any of the provisions of the Act. The learned mover of this Bill, instead of proposing any amendment to any one particular section of the Act, has brought forward a repealing Bill for the purpose of re-enacting certain provisions with certain modifications. I would have been very much obliged if there had been a discussion of the various provisions that are now proposed. It is not an easy matter to interfere with the existing provisions of a Social legislation nor is it ordinarily permissible to interfere with the existing customs especially in a matter concerning communities in respect of whose privileges, doubts and disputes have been settled by a statute,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Puthupally S. Krishna Pillai.]

It is only 14 years since such an enactment was passed concerning the Ezhava Community and it is for the House to consider whether it is in the interests of the community that a new Act should be enacted. When the Bill is referred to a Select Committee, it may be agitated or contended that the Bill being one affecting the entire Ezhava community, one of the important communities in the State, it cannot be proceeded with except by ascertaining public opinion by touring round the country and by taking evidence. It is very likely that the members of the Committee may put forward such a contention because Government will not be in a position to support or oppose any of the proposals contained in this Bill.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: (not heard.)

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: This is a repealing Bill, amending and consolidating Bill, which seeks to repeal the Act and re-enact it with certain modifications. It is not an amending Bill in the sense in which an amending Bill is understood.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN: ഈഴവപ്രതിനിധികൾ ഈ ബില്ലിന്റെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ള അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളെല്ലാം ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: In a legislative measure like this, the attitude of Government cannot depend entirely on a resolution passed by the S. N. D. P. Yogam or on any article written in any newspaper in the State,

MR. N. R. KSISHNAN: ഈ ബിൽ ഗസറ്റിൽ പരസ്യം ചെയ്തതിനു ശേഷം ഈഴവസമുദായത്തിൽപെട്ട ആരിൽനിന്നെങ്കിലും എതിരഭിപ്രായം ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു കിട്ടിയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: That is exactly what I have stated, that Government are not in a position to say one way or the other or back the Bill, or express their opinion in respect of any amendment contained in the Bill, without sufficient materials.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI (*Vaikom* cum *Kottayam*): May I know whether it will be sufficient if the Select Committee makes suitable amendments in the existing Bill instead of adopting this Bill?

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: In a social legislation like this concerning one of the biggest communities in the State, it is doubtful.....

PRESIDENT: It seems to me that the proper way of agitating this subject and these particular points would be by having a certain amount of discussion on the Bill at this stage. Then of course the country, the Government and the honourable members of this House may express their opinions. It is of course open to any honourable member of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the House to propose that public opinion be collected in respect of this Bill. That procedure is open and if honourable members think that the eliciting of opinion is of sufficient importance and the opinion of the community has not been sufficiently directed to the main points of the Bill, then it is open to them in this House to suggest that public opinion should be elicited. But at the present time, so far as I am concerned as President, all that I know is that an honourable member has moved that the Bill be read.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Sir, the motion that the Bill be read in the Assembly is carried and the member in charge of the Bill was about to move the other motion that it may be referred to a Select Committee. According to Standing Order No. 32 I wish to know whether the Legal Remembrancer.....

PRESIDENT. It is open to any honourable member of this House to move that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : That should have been done before this motion.

PRESIDENT : I do not think that there is any time limit to it. If so, the honourable member will refresh my memory.

I should like to know whether any honourable member has got any observations to make on the Bill and about the further progress of the Bill.

MR PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : It was pointed out that there was no objection raised by any honourable member and the proposal is that it be referred to a Select Committee. As member representing the Government, I have to state that it may not be possible to support the motion that the Committee must be a touring committee collecting evidence with regard to the amendments contained in the Bill. I doubt very much whether a special mandate must be given to the Select Committee to report it in the form of an amending Bill rather than an amending and consolidating Bill. I would certainly have to know the opinion of the honourable members of this House on some of the important proposals contained in the Bill and how it will be received by the community at large. In fact there are proposals for interference with intestate succession, marriage, provision relating to dissolution of marriages and various other important matters.

PRESIDENT : Please remind me whether in our rules, any motion for the purpose of collecting public opinion is provided for.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : It is permissible. In the last Session.....

PRESIDENT : Under our Rules is any time limit fixed for that purpose ? I do not see any. Is there any, Mr. Velayudhan Pillai ?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : I was pointing out paragraph 86, page 31.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT: Is there any provision under our Standing Orders regarding collection of public opinion and the time for such a motion to be made?

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: The matter is covered by Standing Order No 32, page 31. "At any time.....

PRESIDENT: There is a lacuna in our legislative rules. A motion for the purpose of circulating a Bill in order to eliciting public opinion is permissible either at the initial stage or even at the time when the motion for referring to the Select Committee is being made. Such a motion is permissible in other Legislatures. I find that our rules do not provide for it. I am prepared to recognise the validity of such a motion although it is not covered in so many terms by our Rules and I am prepared to admit the motion if the House is of opinion that public opinion should be elicited before proceeding with this item of the legislative business. To a large extent, I suppose the opinion of the House will be governed by the opinion of the community.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, when the Anti-dowry Bill was discussed, the motion was passed that the Bill be republished for eliciting public opinion.

PRESIDENT: Therefore, at this stage, before the actual motion for referring the Bill to the Select Committee is made, I am perfectly prepared to allow a motion to be moved for circulation of the Bill for eliciting public opinion.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Sir, I may be permitted to make a few observations.

PRESIDENT: The point must be made perfectly clear. At the present moment there is Mr. N. R. Krishnan in possession of the House. In other words, he has moved that the Bill be referred to a select committee consisting of certain members whose names were on the tip of his tongue before an interruption came. It is possible for other honourable members to get up and move that instead of referring the Bill to a select committee it may be circulated for eliciting public opinion. Unless somebody moves that, Mr. N. R. Krishnan will be allowed to move his motion.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: Sir, I move that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Sir, I oppose the motion. In opposing it I have to make a few observations. Sir, the amendments that are now before the House have been made to remedy a longstanding need which the public felt out of the Bill of 1101 and these amendments are the natural consequence of that feeling. Now to me it appears the amendments and the Bill have been published in the Gazette and sufficient time has elapsed after the publication. And so far not a word has come out of the community against the amendments or against the provisions of the Bill. I would

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

also submit that the S. N. D. P. Yogam which represents the community in toto and of which fact nobody will disagree has given their approbation to this Bill. The Yogam has also constituted a sub-committee to go into the question of this Bill and to give proper suggestions and advice on the matter; and a committee is now engaged in that work. I would also submit that the only daily paper of the community wrote a very strong leader upon the Bill recommending the amendments. I would also suggest that "The Sahodaran" a paper which is edited by the President of the Yogam itself—I mean Mr. K. Aiyyappan—wrote very strongly favouring the amendments of the Bill. And I know as a matter of fact, that the public opinion among the community is strongly in favour of this Bill and the amendments. It was stated here that the Bill interferes with inestate succession and all such important matters. But I may suggest that these are things which we have to consider during the discussion on the provisions of the Bill. Sir, this is not the time to postpone things and republish the Bill for consideration at the hands of the public.

PRESIDENT: That is not the motion at hand. The motion is that the Bill be circulated and public opinion elicited.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Sir, there is no necessity for the Bill to be circulated. It has already been in the hands of the public for a sufficient period of time. After having been in publication for so long a period, after having been heard no opposition from any corner of the State nor from any section of the community I submit that it can be taken for granted that the general sense of the community is that it really needs such a Bill. With these words I submit that the further progress of the consideration of the Bill may be expedited.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN: സർ, ഈ ബിൽ ഗസറ്റിൽ പരസ്യംചെയ്ത എല്ലാ ജനസമുദായങ്ങളും അതിനെപ്പറ്റി അറിഞ്ഞുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ട് വളരെ നാളുകൾ കഴിഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈഴവരുടെ സംഗതികളിൽ അവ ഗാഢമായി ചിന്തിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി. യോഗം ഇതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഗൌരവമായി ആലോചിക്കുകയും ഈ ബിൽ ഉടനടി പാസാക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായത്തിൽ എത്തിച്ചേരുകയും ചെയ്തിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ യാതൊരസൗകര്യങ്ങളുമുണ്ടാക്കാതെ ബില്ല് തുടൻപോകേണ്ടതു് അത്യാവശ്യമാകയാൽ ഇതിനെ സെലക്ട്കമ്മിറ്റിക്കു അയയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായത്തോടു ഞാൻ യോജിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: Sir, the present Bill totally repeals the existing Bill.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR: Sir, the honourable member is the mover of the motion and he is speaking on it again. Is it in order Sir?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT : I will call upon him afterwards.

MR. E. E. PANDARATHIL : Sir, I would like to support the motion made by Mr. Madhavan especially as there are certain sections in the proposed Bill which affects vitally the question of marriage and provisions for succession. Since it would affect the length and breadth of the Hindu religion, and I am afraid, other religions also and since it partakes of many of the broader aspects of law like civil marriage, as anyone can be an Ezhava on declaring himself so,I think it is proper that the Bill be circulated.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : ഞാൻ ഈ അമൻറുമെൻറിനെ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു. ഈഴവബിൽ ഈ സഭമുമ്പാകെ അവതരിപ്പിക്കുകയും ഗസറ്റിൽ പരസ്യപ്പെടുത്തുകയും ചെയ്ത് അതിനെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായമെന്താണെന്നു അറിഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. പൊതുജനങ്ങളുടെ അഭിപ്രായം അറിയാതെ ഇതിൽ ഒന്നും തന്നെ ചെയ്തിട്ടില്ല. പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായം അറിയുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടി ഗവണ്മെൻറിൽനിന്നും പ്രധാനമായി ചെയ്തുവരുന്നതു ഗവണ്മെൻറു ഗസറ്റിൽ അതു പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തുക എന്നുള്ളതാണ്. ജനങ്ങളും തങ്ങളുടെ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളും അറിയിക്കുന്നതു പത്രങ്ങൾ മുഖേനയാണ്. ഈ രണ്ടു വഴിയിൽക്കൂടിയും ഈ ബില്ലിനു രാജ്യത്തിൻറെ നാനാഭാഗങ്ങളിലും വേണ്ടത്ര പ്രചാരം സിദ്ധിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്.

VARKALA K. MADHAVAN : ബില്ലിനെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള അഭിപ്രായമെന്താണെന്നു ചിറയിൻകീഴ് താലൂക്കിലെ പ്രമാണികളുമായി ആലോചിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലുള്ള എല്ലാ ഈഴവരുടേയും പ്രതിനിധ്യം വഹിക്കുന്ന എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി. യോഗത്തിൽ—ഈ അടുത്തകാലത്തുതന്നെ ഈ തിരുവനന്തപുരം ടൌണിൽ കൂടിയ സമ്മേളനത്തിൽ—വച്ചു ഇതിനെപ്പറ്റി അദ്ധ്യക്ഷപ്രസംഗത്തിൽ പ്രസ്താവിക്കുകയും സിക്രട്ടറി പ്രസംഗിക്കുകയും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. അവിടെവച്ചു റിട്ടയാർഡ് ഹൈക്കോടതി ജഡ്ജി മി. കുമാരനേയും റിട്ടയാർഡ് ജഡ്ജി മി. ഗോവിന്ദനേയും എന്നെയും ചേർത്തു ഇതിലേക്കു ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റി രൂപീകരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി. യോഗത്തിൻറെ സുസമ്മതനേതാവായ മി. അയ്യപ്പൻ നടത്തുന്ന പത്രത്തിൽ ഈ ബില്ലിനെപ്പറ്റി മുകുകണ്ഠം അഭിനന്ദിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി. യോഗത്തിലെ അംഗങ്ങളും മറ്റു പ്രതിനിധികളും ആരും തന്നെ ഈ ബില്ലിനെപ്പറ്റി ഒരക്ഷരംപോലും എതിരു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. സമുദായത്തെ അലങ്കോലപ്പെടുത്ത

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ത്തക്കവിധത്തിൽ ഇതിനെ നീട്ടിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകണമെന്നാണ് ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം കൊണ്ടു ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നതു്. ഞാൻ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ബില്ലിൽ മറ്റു ബില്ലുകളിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തിയിരിക്കുന്ന സംഗതികളെല്ലാം ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തി എന്നു് മാത്രമേ ഉള്ളു. നായർറഗുലേഷൻ ക്ഷ ൦ വ്യ-ൽ പാസായിട്ടു പത്തുവർഷം കഴിയുന്നതിനുമുമ്പാണു് അതിനു ഒരു അമെൻറുമെൻറു് വേണമെന്നു ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ഈഴവബിൽ പാസായിക്കിട്ടിയ ആ വർഷത്തിലാണു നായർബില്ലിനെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള അമൻറുമെൻറു പാസയതു്. എൻെറ മാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ ലീഗൽ റിമംബ്രൻസർ അവർകൾ പറയുന്നതു് ഈഴവബിൽ പാസായിട്ടു ക്ഷ വർഷങ്ങളേ ആയിട്ടുള്ളു, അതിനുമുമ്പു് അതിൽ ഭേദഗതി വരുത്തണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. എന്നാണു്. എന്നാൽ നായർബിൽ പാസായി പത്തുകൊല്ലം കഴിഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അതിനെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള അമൻറുമെൻറു് എന്ന മാത്രമല്ല പുതിയ ബില്ലുകൂടി പാസായി. നായർസമുദായത്തിൻെറ പിൻതുടർച്ചാവകാശത്തെക്കാൾ ഒരു സ്റ്റെപ്പു് മുകളിലാണു ഈഴവസമുദായം സ്ഥിതിചെയ്തിരുന്നതു്. നായർസമുദായത്തിൽ ഒരു മരുമക്കത്തായം മാത്രമേ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നുള്ളു. ഈഴവസമുദായത്തിൽ മിശ്രമായംകൂടി ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു. ആ സ്ഥിതിയിലാണു ക്ഷ ക്ഷ ൦ ക്ഷ-ൽ ഞങ്ങളുടെ ബിൽ പാസായതു്. ഞങ്ങൾക്കു് ആദ്യമായി കിട്ടിയ ബില്ലായതുകൊണ്ടുമാത്രമാണു ഞങ്ങൾ അതിനെ സ്വീകരിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതു്. അതുനിമിത്തം ഈ പതിമൂന്നു വർഷത്തിനിടക്കു ഈ സമുദായത്തിനു പല ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടുകളും അനുഭവിക്കേണ്ടിവന്നിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതിലുണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ള വിഷമങ്ങളുടെ പരിഹാരത്തിനുവേണ്ടിയാണു ഈ ബിൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ആ ബില്ലിനെപ്പറ്റി ഇനിയും പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായം അറിയണമെന്നു പറയുന്നതിൽ അർത്ഥമില്ല. പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായത്തെ നിർബന്ധിച്ചു പറയിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിനു ഗവൺമെൻറു ആവശ്യപ്പെടുവാൻ പാടുള്ളതല്ല. പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായത്തിനു ഒരിക്കൽകൂടി അവസരം കൊടുത്തു സമയം നീട്ടി സമുദായോന്നതിയെ തടയേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. സമുദായത്തിൻെറ അഭ്യുദയത്തെ കാംക്ഷിക്കുന്ന ഒരാൾ അങ്ങിനെ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെടുകയില്ല.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : അഭിപ്രായവ്യത്യാസമുള്ള സംഗതികൾക്കു അമൻറുമെൻറു് കൊണ്ടുവന്നു പാസ്സാക്കിയാൽ പോരേ?

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : അമൻറുമെൻറുകൊണ്ടു മാത്രം പോരാ. നായർറഗുലേഷനിലും ഇതേതരത്തിലായിരുന്നു. അമൻറുമെൻറുകൊണ്ടുവന്നു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. N. R. Krishnan.]

പ്രധാനപ്പെട്ട വകുപ്പുകൾ മാറുമ്പോൾ വാലുവേറെ തല വേറെ എന്ന മാതിരിയിൽ വകുപ്പുകളുടെ പൊതുവെയുള്ള ഭംഗിക്കു കേടുവന്നു ചേരുന്നതാണ്. അതിനെക്കാൾ പുതിയബില്ലു് എന്നു പറയുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു യാതൊരു തരക്കേടുമില്ല.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN : അഭിപ്രായവ്യത്യാസങ്ങൾക്കു അമൻറുമെൻറുകൊണ്ടു സിലക്ട് കമ്മിറ്റിയിൽ ഭേദഗതിവരുത്താൻ പാടില്ലേ?

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : സിലക്ട് കമ്മിറ്റിയ്ക്കുതന്നെ പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായം അറിഞ്ഞു ഏതു് അമൻറുമെൻറും അതിൽ വരുത്താവുന്നതാണ്.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN സിലക്ട് കമ്മിറ്റിയിൽ ബില്ലു വരുമ്പോൾ പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായം വരുത്തരുതോ?

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായം എപ്പോൾ വേണമെങ്കിലും വരുത്താൻ കഴിയുന്നതാണ്.

MR. P. S. MUHAMED : ഈ ബില്ലിൻെറ തത്വത്തെ ഈ സഭ അംഗീകരിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞു. വമ്പിച്ച ഒരു സമുദായത്തെ പൊതുവേ ബാധിക്കുന്നതായ ഈ ബിൽ സമുദായത്തിൻെറ പൊതുവായ അഭിപ്രായത്തിനു അനുകൂലമല്ലാതിരിക്കുമോ എന്നുള്ള ഭയംകൊണ്ടാണു ഇതിനെ വീണ്ടും പ്രചരിപ്പിച്ചു് സമുദായത്തിൻെറ അഭിപ്രായമെന്തെന്നു അറിഞ്ഞാൽകൊള്ളാമെന്ന അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടതു്. ഈഴവസമുദായത്തിന് അല്പമെങ്കിലും ദോഷം വരത്തക്കവിധത്തിലുള്ള ഏതെങ്കിലും സംഗതികൾ ഈ സഭയിൽ വന്നാൽ അതിനെ ഒരിക്കലും സമ്മതിച്ചുകൊടുക്കാതെ വളരെ ശക്തിയോടുകൂടി എതിർക്കുന്ന ഒൻപതോ പത്തോ മെമ്പറന്മാർ ഈ സഭയിൽ ഉണ്ടു്. ഈ ബില്ലിൻെറ തത്വം അംഗീകരിച്ച ഈ സന്ദർഭംവരെ അവരിൽ ആരുംതന്നെ എതിരഭിപ്രായം പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചിട്ടില്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടു ഈ ബില്ലിനെക്കുറിച്ചു സമുദായത്തിനും എതിരഭിപ്രായമില്ലെന്നു മനസ്സിലാക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. ഈഴവസമുദായത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു പറയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ സാമുദായികമായി അവക്കുണ്ടാകാവുന്ന ദോഷങ്ങളെ സൂക്ഷിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഒരു സമുദായം വേറെ ഉണ്ടോ എന്നുള്ളതു സംശയമാണ്. അങ്ങനെ വളരെ കരുതലോടുകൂടി പ്രവർത്തിക്കുന്നതിനു സൗകര്യമുള്ള സംഘടനകൾ ഒന്നുതന്നെ ഈ ബിൽ ദോഷകരമാണെന്നു പറയാതിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു അവരുടെ ഇടയിൽ എതിരഭിപ്രായം ഉണ്ടെന്നു വിചാരിക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN: ഈ ബിൽ ഗുണകരമാണെന്ന പറഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ലേ?

MR. P. S. MUHAMED : ഉണ്ട്. എതിരഭിപ്രായം വല്ലതുമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു ഇതിനുമുമ്പേ വരേണ്ടതായിരുന്നു. അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള എതിരഭിപ്രായങ്ങളും ഈ പ്രധാനപ്പെട്ട സംഘടനകളോട് ഉത്തരവാദിത്വം വഹിക്കുന്നവർ ആരുംതന്നെ പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചിട്ടില്ലാത്തസ്ഥിതിക്കു ഈ ബില്ലിനെ മറ്റു വിധത്തിൽ ശങ്കിക്കേണ്ടയാവശ്യമില്ല. ഒരു താലൂക്കിലോ പകുതിയിലൊ ഉള്ള നാലഞ്ചുപേരോട് ആലോചിച്ചില്ല എന്നുള്ള കാരണത്തെ മാത്രം അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി ഏറ്റവും വലിയ ഒരു സമുദായത്തിന്റെ രക്ഷയ്ക്കായി കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഈ ബില്ലിനെ കുറേക്കാലംകൂടി ഇനിയും നീട്ടിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകാമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നതു പൊതുവേ ജനസമുദായത്തിന്റെ നന്മയ്ക്കു തന്നെ ഹാനികരമായിരിക്കുകയില്ലേ എന്നു സംശയിക്കേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. സമുദായത്തിനു പൊതുവേ ബാധിക്കുന്ന ദോഷങ്ങളെ ചൂണ്ടിക്കാണിക്കുന്നതിനു ഈ സഭയിൽതന്നെ പ്രമാണികരും ഉള്ളതുകൊണ്ടും അവർക്ക് ഈ ബിൽ പാസ്സാക്കിക്കിട്ടണമെന്നാഗ്രഹമുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടും അവർ ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നതിനനുസരണമായി ബില്ലിനെ അനുകൂലിക്കയാണു മറ്റു സമുദായക്കാർ പ്രധാനമായി ചെയ്യേണ്ടതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ ഈ മോഷനെ നിഷേധിക്കുന്നു.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I wish to offer a few remarks on the motion that is now before the House. I may also say beforehand that my statements should not be misinterpreted by the honourable members of this House. It would appear that there is an impression prevailing among the members of this House that this is a matter affecting exclusively the members of the Ezhava community. But those who have carefully read the Bill could say whether it should be republished or whether more public opinion should be elicited with regard to certain proposals contained in it. It is a matter which the House is seized of and I would earnestly entreat honourable members of this House to consider all the important provisions of the Bill and then to decide whether it is a matter on which further public opinion may be elicited. Personally I am of the view that this could not be lightly referred to the select committee. This is a Bill about which no discussion took place in this House. In this connection I would refer to a particular provision contained in clause 3 of the Bill.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : ബില്ലിന്റെ ഡീറ്റെയിൽസിൽ പോകേണ്ട ആവശ്യം ഇപ്പോഴുണ്ടോ?

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: No, Sir.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT : I have only looked now for precedents about this matter. In one of the rulings of the President of the Legislative Assembly it is stated thus :

> "..... that the question that is being debated at present is only the narrow question whether the Bill should be taken into consideration now or whether it should be circulated for opinion. It is not open, therefore, to Members to go into the merits of the various points which they may wish to be further considered. They can merely indicate the points on which they think there should be further consideration by the country".

That I suppose is what you are trying to bring forward.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : Sir, I am trying to emphasise the fact that it is not a Bill exclusively intended for the Ezhava community. It is a Bill certain provisions of which affect a very large section of the people who belong to other communities. So, it is necessary to get their opinion. The existing provision in the Ezhava Act with regard to marriage is as follows :—

That applies only to the Ezhava community. The proposed provision states that the conjugal union of an Ezhava male with any Hindu shall be a valid marriage. There are other Acts governing various other communities and this provision will affect all those Acts. Therefore, I ask "is it a matter exclusively for the Ezhavas?"

PRESIDENT : Order. Order. But up till now I find that no other community which is sought to be affected by this provision of the Bill has raised any protest about it. I find also that the Bill was published in February.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : സ്പെഷ്യൽ മാര്യേജ് ബിൽ സെലക്ട് കമ്മിറ്റിയുടെ പരിശോധനയിൽ ഇരിക്കുന്നതായറിയാമോ?

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : But they were dealing with a different set of circumstances. To say that this is a matter on which public opinion need not be elicited or that the verdict of the S. N. D. P. Yogam or the "Sahodaran" is the final word about it, is not judging the matter from a correct point of view.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: May I ask the Legal Remembrancer whether a period of seven months is not sufficient time for the public to express their opinion on the matter of this Bill?

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : But that is a matter for the House to decide?

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN : May I know whether objection has been raised by any section of the community about this?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : No, Sir. Government are not aware of it. Sir, in a matter relating to marriage.....

PRESIDENT : Order, order. The whole question is, when the matter comes up to be discussed, the question arises whether it is proposed to alter the Hindu Law by this? If so, the question will hav

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

to be considered from the point of view of the Hindu Law. To that extent you are right in pointing out your position.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Yes, Sir. I am only trying to point out that honourable members should not be under the impression that this is a matter affecting the Ezhavas alone. Sufficient public attention has not been drawn to the various provisions contained in it. I refer to the last provision contained in this Bill, *viz.*, clause 21. The honourable mover provides that– "For the purposes of partition the members of a Marumakkathayam Taravad shall be deemed to be tenants-in-common from the date of the passing of this Act". Now, what is the significance of that provision? Is it a matter which affects Ezhavas alone?

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN: ഈ വക സംഗതികളെല്ലാം സെലക്ട കമ്മിറ്റിയിൽ വച്ച് ആലോചിക്കാൻ പാടില്ലേ ?

MR PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: No, no; what I say in respect of the motion now before us is, that there are serious difficulties involved in this Bill and that public attention has not been sufficiently elicited regarding the several provisions. The interest the public at large are likely to show in a matter of this kind is not yet ascertained. I am only referring to those important provisions contained in this Bill. Already, the Rule relating to partition of Tarawad property has begun to be condemned by the public and those who have had the supposed benefit arising therefrom. Now, people have begun to entertain feelings contrary to those accepted at the time the measure was enacted. Whatever that may be, that is a matter which is left to the members of this House. But it must be borne in mind that it is a matter which affects not only the Ezhava community but all the communities of the State at large. To declare that all Ezhavas who are now enjoying the privilege of partition within certain limits shall be deemed to be tenants-in-common for the purpose of partition of the Tarawad property is a course which will bring untold hardship to the members of that community. This is a matter which requires very serious consideration. We have to see how these provisions affect the members of the other communities and how it will affect the economic position of the country. These provisions, I am sure, will affect the entire population of the State. My own impression is that if, perhaps, they discuss the proposals, all these matters could be thrashed out. If the attention of the public is drawn to this piece of legislation and if "the Sahodharan", the "Powraprabha" and other papers are allowed to express their opinion about this, it would help this House a good deal. I therefore request the honourable members to consider the implications contained in these two clauses and I am sure if they do so they will be provoked to more efficient criticism of the Bill. Personally I am not convinced that public attention has been drawn to the far-reaching and important provisions contained in these two sections. I

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Puthupally S. Krishna Pillai.]

am inclined therefore to support the motion made by Mr. Madhavan that there must be further circulation of this Bill before the matter is referred to the Select Committee.

So far as the Select Committee itself is concerned, I have explained my position that Government will not be able to support any move relating to collection of evidence and similar proceedings. If it is referred to the Select Committee, of course, the Select Committee would have to re-draft the Bill and bring it forward in the form of an amendment Bill.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER: Sir, I oppose the motion of Mr. Madhavan. The two fundamental principles which are sought to be enacted against the present Bill are (1) the marital arrangements and...

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I did not refer to the details. I referred only to two prominent or outstanding features of the Bill.

PRESIDENT: As a matter of fact, it could not be.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER: The other principle is that contained in Section 21 relating to the partition of the Tarwad property. This is a most important provision and I wish to bring to the attention of the honourable members one fact in this connection. Among the Ezhavas there were some big Taravads at the time when the Ezhava Regulation was enacted in 1100. Some of the families even sought exemption from the operation of the Bill then. One of the families that so sought the exemption was my own family. We found afterwards that it was a foolish step on our part to have sought the exemption and we have divided ourselves since then. Not only we, but as a matter of fact, by the operation of the present Ezhava Regulation for the last 14 years, almost all the so called Taravads were divided and Ezhavas have now got mainly only the Makkathayam properties. So, no harm will be done to the community by this provision if the present Bill is enacted so far as the Taravad properties are concerned.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: May I know whether the members of the Ezhava community are not owning property as tenants-in-common and as joined owners?

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: Sir, at present, the Marumakkathayam property is being enjoyed as tenants-in-common after the partitions of the Taravads.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: May I know whether a major portion of the persons in the community are not still in existence where the Marumakkathayam Taravad property is not divided?

MR. K. KUNJU PANIKKAR All the properties which were inherited after, 1100 are to go to the children by the Makkathayam system of inheritance. Taravad properties which ought to be enjoyed as tenants-in-common are not in existence now among the Ezhavas.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT: When the expression "tenants-in-common" is used, does the honourable member mean the ordinary English Law sense or any special sense?— because this means that there can be no alienation without the consensual operation of either party.....

MR. KUNJU PANICKER: Yes, Sir; that is the meaning.

PRESIDENT: So that, if there are three minor members of a family, unless all of them come together there can be no borrowing on the basis of that property.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: That is the idea. That was the case with reference to Taravad property after the enactment of the present Act. But with reference to Marumakkathayam property which was inherited from father after the commencement of the Regulation, all the properties were to be enjoyed as tenants-in-common. Only the Taravad property was to be enjoyed as joint property. That is all what I have to say with reference to clause 21.

Coming to section 3.....

PRESIDENT: Has the honourable member referred to Section 32 of the Regulation of 1100?

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: Yes. It is slightly different from this. That is Makkathayam property. There we have the privilege of enjoying as tenants-in-common as per the existing Regulation; only the Marumakkathayam Taravad property had to be enjoyed as joint tenants.

Then with reference to the marital arrangement, it is only the parties other than Ezhavas who become married to Ezhavas who may get the benefit as per the present Ezhava Bill. The Ezhavas themselves are not to get any special benefit. No other person's or community's property or wealth is affected by the passing of this Regulation. On the other hand, the opposite party will be benefited from the Ezhava community and through the Ezhava members by new maritial arrangement.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: May I know whether by virtue of the marriage of a party other than an Ezhava that other party is disentitled to that party's share to the Taravad property?

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: That matter will have to be construed according to the law which is in operation in the case of those parties.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Is the marriage of an Ezhava woman with any Hindu valid under the present law?

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: No.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: I suppose that the marriage of an Ezhava male to a Hindu female is also not recognised?

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: No, as matters stand at present.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: If the legislation governing these communities does not recognise such a union as valid, what will be the sort of inheritance that the honourable member would suggest for the offspring of such a union under the Ezhava Act?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

to MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: In the Ezhava Act a provision which is not applicable to the other parties is now provided by this Regulation, because by the present provision the marriage is made valid and consequently they get naturally the inheritance right.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Sir, in the case of a marriage between a non-Ezhava and an Ezhava, where the children born to them must be provided for in law to inherit the property of the Non-Ezhava mother, how could it be that their marriage is valid?

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: The marriage is valid and the Ezhava party's property inheritance can be secured by the opposite party.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: When in the Nair Act, the Kshatriya Act and the Vellala Act it is stated that marriage between a Nair female with a Nair male or a non-Nair male is alone valid; where that is the law governing Nair males and females, does not this provision go to repeal Section 3 of the Nair Act or Section 3 of the Kshatriya Act or the corresponding Section of the Vellala Act?

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: It is not necessarily so.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN: സ്പെഷ്യൽ മാര്യേജ് എന്ന വകുപ്പിനെ ഇത് അഫക്ട് ചെയ്യുമോ?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: No, Sir. It will not bind. Where two parties who have attained the age of 21 enter into a consensual agreement that they shall celebrate a marriage and the offspring shall inherit only in accordance with the provisions contained in the agreement it amounts to a case of individual liberty. But it proposes to repeal the usual Act. It creates uncertainties and disputes in regard to the marital ties of various other members who are members of the Hindu community. That is my position.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, the learned mover of the Bill said that he had the mandate of the S. N. D. P. Yogam to bring forward a measure of this kind. All the Ezhava members of this House seem also to be of the opinion that a change in the law affecting the Ezhava community is quite necessary. It appears that there were no sort of criticisms against the measure so far as we know. In these circumstances, we thought that being a matter affecting the Ezhava community and the Ezhava members representing the Ezhava community being of the unanimous opinion that a Bill is necessary, it was quite unnecessary for us to devote at this stage that attention to it which a measure of this importance demands. It is on this account that the various details pointed out by the Legal Remembrancer escaped our attention and it was, in fact, on this account that no criticism of any kind was made at this stage against the introduction of this measure. On the contrary, we would like the community, if they desire to effect any change in the existing law, to do so and we will be quite willing to help the community to effect that change. The learned mover of the Bill said that he has no objection to make suitable amendments in the existing law at the Committee stage of the Bill. If that can be done, and if that could satisfy the members of the community, I think

there could be no objection whatever in allowing the member to move the Bill and send it to the Select Committee with the mandate that at the Committee stage suitable amendments may be introduced in the existing law and that encroachments into the domain of the laws of other communities be revised. So far as the question of marriage is concerned, it is a sort of civil marriage that is proposed by the definition of the word "Marriage" in this Bill". Of course these are matters which could easily be amended at the committee stage. Therefore I think it would be better if the Select Committee is asked to make suitable amendments in the existing law so as to give effect to the main provisions contained in this Bill.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: I was provoked by the Legal Remembrancer to consider the Bill. Frankly speaking I was thinking and was under the impression that this is a Bill after all affecting only the Ezhava community and as such I need not say anything in the matter. But after hearing some of the arguments of the members, I wanted to know how they propose to justify the radical changes that are to be provided for in the Bill. I was at a handicap to understand how the member in charge of the Bill proposes to justify to introduce these changes. At that juncture the Legal Remembrancer intervened and made us understand the real implication which at first appeared to be rather innocuous. As the Bill affects marriage relationships and inheritance of property I am afraid that as much attention as is necessary has not been bestowed on the Bill and as such it has got to be revised in the light of public opinion. Further it is necessary that all the members of the community should be given some voice. This Bill deserves circulation for public opinion. I am even prone to think that even non-Ezhava communities should consider this Bill seriously. Let me by way of illustration take the case where the Bill deals with the inheritance of property. It has got reference only to the Makkathayam property—that was what Mr. Kunju Panicker said—and it does not refer to Marumakkathayam property. I am one of those who believe that ever since the introduction of the Ezhava Act in 1101—and it is only fourteen years now—there are persons who have got partition of Marumakkathayam property and a major portion of them are still enjoying it and it may be the case that some have even encumbered their property. Are those properties sought to be affected by this Bill. That means the Bill will affect certain men who have advanced loans for trade or for redeeming properties or for conducting marriages.

Then with regard to marriages. I wanted an explanation on the point from the member but he contended himself by saying that it is only the children of Ezhava men resulting from a marriage with a non-Ezhava woman that will be affected. I wanted to know how children born of such associations will be affected by the law pertaining to either part of the community in separate. In other words let me take an example. Supposing there is a marriage between an Ezhava male and a non-Exhava female. Suppose there are children born of such union. Then according to Mr. Kunju Panicker the children may

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai]

be entitled to the Ezhava father's property. Supposing these children clamour for their share of the mother's property. How does it affect the case according to the Nair Regulation? Can such children take the property of the mother who may be a Nair female. If such cases are involved, surely members of the other community have also a right to say something on the matter. So in these circumstances I suggest that the Bill be taken into serious consideration. Evidently when the Bill appeared with the title Ezhava Bill naturally other members were hoping that it is for the Ezhava community and their representatives to decide. In fact I was under that impression.

PRESIDENT: Honourable members are expected to read.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Not with so much attention till after provocation. I believe there is very strong force in the argument.....

PRESIDENT: The real difficulty is that sufficient attention has not been paid by the non-official members.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: I admit that. But there is justification for it. We thought the Bill after all concerns only the Ezhava community and there are responsible persons of the Ezhava community in the House and we need not take so much pains to understand it. But I now feel that there is force in the opposition of the Legal Remembrancer. The Bill has got to be seriously considered by the public and it does not matter even if one or two months elapse for it will not affect the community much. If the Ezhavas can remain for fourteen years I cannot understand why they cannot remain for three for four months more. I heartily support the motion before the House.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: If a non-Ezhava male marries an Ezhava female how will the Bill affect their children?

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: That are all matters to be considered by them. What I want to say is that the community belonging to non-Ezhavas do not now realise the implications of the Bill. Supposing my son marries an Ezhava woman and begets children. Can they claim my property? I do not think therefore that this Bill is the exclusive concern of the Ezhavas only. It affects all and therefore it ought to be circulated.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN: സിവിൽ മാര്യേജ് ബിൽമൂലം ഇതര ജാതികളിൽ വിവാഹം ചെയ്യുന്നതിൽ ജനിക്കുന്ന കുട്ടികൾക്കും സ്വത്തിനു അവകാശമുണ്ടാകുന്നതാണല്ലൊ.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: അതു ആലോചനയുടെ എടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളതല്ലെയുള്ളൂ. ഞാൻ അപ്പോൾ ഒരു മെമ്പർ ആണെങ്കിൽ എനിക്കു അതിനെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള അഭിപ്രായം ആ സമയം പറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളാം.

MR. P. S. MUHAMED: അങ്ങിനെ വിവാഹം ചെയ്യുന്നപക്ഷം ഈഴവേതരസമുദായങ്ങളുടെ സ്വത്തിനു ബാധകമായി വരുന്നില്ലായെങ്കിലൊ?

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: അതു ബാധകമാകുമൊ ഇല്ലയൊ എന്നു തീർച്ചപ്പെട്ടിട്ടില്ല. ഒരു കേസ്സിൽ തീർച്ചപ്പെട്ടുവന്നാലെ അതിനെ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

പ്പറ്റി നിശ്ചയിക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയുള്ളൂ. മറ്റു സമുദായക്കാരുടെ സ്വത്തിനു ബാധകമാകുന്നില്ലായെന്നു തീർച്ചയുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ എനിക്കു അതിനോടു പൊന്നുമില്ല.

The question that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion was put to vote and declared lost.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I demand a poll.

A poll was accordingly taken and the House divided as follows:—

AYES—4.

1	Mr. E. E. Pandarathil	3	Mr. Varkala K. Madhavan
2	,, Kannanthodath Janardhanan Nair	4	,, M. Sivathanu Pillai

NOES—20.

1	Mr. P. C. Adichan	12	Sahib Bahadur P. S. Muhamed
2	,, K. Dominic Joseph	13	,, M. K. Mackar Pillai
3	,, M. L. Janardana Pillai	14	Mr. K. Narayanaperumal Nadar
4	,, N. V. Joseph	15	,, M. R. Narayana Pillai
5	,, Padiyara Joseph Kunju	16	,, K. R. Narayanan
6	,, K. P. Kochukora Tharakan	17	,, Codiveetil C. Ramankunju
7	,, N. R. Krishnan	18	,, N. Velu Achari
8	,, A. K. Kumaran Vaidyan	19	,, Murukumpuzha V. Kunjukrishnan
9	,, P. Kunjukrishnan	20	,, T. T. Kesavan Sastri
10	,, K. Kunju Panickar		
11	Sahib Bahadur H. O. L. Marikar		

NEUTRALS—26.

1	Mr. Kottalil P. Abraham	14	Mr. K. G. Govindan
2	,, Joseph Vithayathil	15	,, G. Velu Pillai
3	,, P. V. Mathai Chemparathy	16	,, P. Narayana Pillai
4	,, C. Jebamony Nadar	17	,, R. Narayanan Nambootiri
5	,, E. P. Varghese	18	,, M. K. Nilakanta Aiyar
6	,, D. Francis	19	,, S. Sundaracarajan
7	Sahib Bahadur N. M. Muhamed Abdul Kadir	20	,, C. Kumara Das
8	Mr. M. L. D'Cruz	21	M. S. Doraswami Aiyangar
9	,, Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai	22	Khan Bahadur G. S. Abdul Karim Sahib Suhrawardy
10	,, P. Sivarama Pillai	23	Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao
11	Srimati T. Narayani Amma	24	,, M. K. Gopala Pillai
12	,, K. Devaki Antharjanam	25	,, P. Raman Pillai
13	Mr. S. Chattanatha Karayalar	26	,, Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN: സർ, എല്ലാ അഫിഷ്യൽ മെമ്പറന്മാരും എന്നു സിക്രട്ടറി പറഞ്ഞു. ഒരാൾ കുറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT : I have always stated that especially during a closure and during Budget time the necessity for the presence of all the official members is essential. I have said so and Government will take measures hereafter to see that all official members are present. At present there are only nine.

The motion was lost four voting *for* twenty *against* and twenty six remaining *neutral*.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN : സർ, ഈ ബിൽ താഴെ പേർ പറയുന്ന ആളുകളടങ്ങിയ ഒരു സെലക്ട് കമ്മിറ്റിക്ക് അയയ്ക്കണമെന്നപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

ക. മി. കൈനിക്കര എം. പദ്മനാഭപിള്ള
ഖ. മി. വൈക്കം എൻ. രാമകൃഷ്ണപിള്ള
ഗ. മി. പി. എസ്. മഹമ്മദ്
ഘ. മി. ഇ. പി. വർഗീസ്
ങ. മി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞുപണിക്കർ
ച. മി. വക്കല കെ. മാധവൻ
ഛ. മി. പി. കുഞ്ഞുകൃഷ്ണൻ
ജ. മി. കെ. ആർ. നാരായണൻ
ഝ. മി. ഏ. കെ. കുമാരൻ വൈദ്യൻ
ഞ. മി. എസ്സ് കൃഷ്ണപിള്ള. (ലീഗൽ റിമെംബ്രൻസർ)
ട. മി. ഇ. സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ
ഠ. മി. എസ്. ചട്ടനാഥ കരയാളർ
ഡ. മി. എൻ. ആർ. കൃഷ്ണൻ

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER : I second it.

The motion of Mr. N. R. Krishnan that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put to vote and carried.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : The time within which the committee shall report is not provided.

PRESIDENT : It will report within four months.

THE TRAVANCORE CHITTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. E. P. VARGHESE : I move that the Travancore Chitties Act Amendment Bill be taken into consideration.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : I second it.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : The motion must be formally put and adopted.

PRESIDENT : Yes. The honourable member may say what he wants.

MR. PUTHUPALLY S. KRISHNA PILLAI : The provisions contained in this Bill deals with complicated questions. It says :—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly